

Message

From: Weiss, Leanne (ECY) [lewe461@ECY.WA.GOV]
Sent: 8/27/2018 9:33:41 PM
To: Hodgkiss, Miranda [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=9d441ddb44ac4ed486058d2c2690b977-Hodgkiss, Miranda]
Subject: RE: DRAFT R10 TMDL review checklist
Attachments: 17.06.08_Vertical and Horizontal Cell Aggregation_Final.docx; MapOfAllSourcesAug2018.pdf
Flag: Follow up

Thanks Miranda,

Can I share this with other TMDL leads and program staff to make sure they have the most recent version?

A few other things:

- I will forward you an email that has all the contacts for the Deschutes Watershed Council. This includes (among others) everyone who participated in the original Deschutes Advisory Group. It also includes folks who were part of a different group that focused on the Deschutes. The groups were merged, and thought the group is no longer facilitated by Ecology, we continue to use it as a forum for discussing both the Deschutes River and Budd Inlet TMDLs.
 - o If/when you send an email to the group it might be best to use BCC, since it is a merged list and also could elicit responses/debate.
- Here is a link to the 2015 Supplemental Monitoring Report.
<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/1503002.pdf>
 - o This is the most publication we've published using the model. However, we've come a long way since then. For example, we've included some averaging of model cells during post processing and also added a sediment diagenesis module to the model. The result of these two additions indicates that under natural conditions water quality standards can be met. The 2015 report was written under the assumption that they could not be and therefore applies a 0.2 mg/l allowable DO deficit as the standard. The final TMDL will apply the 5/6 mg/l standard.
 - I've attached a memo describing our cell aggregation techniques and reasoning for it. Chris and Laurie reviewed this at some point.
 - o Regardless of what I've described above, the 2015 report has lots of useful information. Here are some sections I recommend reading:
 - Page 11 Introduction (describing the interim nature of the report)
 - Page 12 – 20 (describing the watershed, DO/nutrient/circulation patterns, and the standards and how they apply)
 - Page 21 – 28 (methods, Ecology's robust peer review process, the model, scenarios, how we defined natural conditions)
 - Despite the updates made to the model and post processing the figures provided in the results section of the report still tell a very relevant story. The exact numbers and scale bars have/will get updated but the theme are all the same. The results on the effect of Capitol Lake (page 33 – 39) provides a great summary. I have attached updated maps of results for the four main sources of DO depletion to Budd Inlet.

I hope this is helpful - let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

Leanne

From: Hodgkiss, Miranda [mailto:Hodgkiss.Miranda@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2018 5:24 PM
To: Weiss, Leanne (ECY) <lewe461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Subject: DRAFT R10 TMDL review checklist

Hi Leanne,

Apologies for taking awhile to get this to you. I'm attaching our draft review checklist. It should look similar to the one you've already received, but we have made a few updates. Please note that it is still in draft form – we use it as a team internally, but it doesn't represent EPA-wide policy or guidance. Still, I hope it helps you understand what we are looking for. Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Miranda Hodgkiss
Office of Water and Watersheds
U.S. EPA Region 10
(206) 553-0692
hodgkiss.miranda@epa.gov